



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	O	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,027	-	03/23/2004	Mark Edward Bunnage	PC9430B	4951
28523	7590	09/27/2004		EXAMINER	
PFIZER		MENIT MC0260 1611	BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN		
PATENT DEPARTMENT, MS8260-1611 EASTERN POINT ROAD				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
GROTON	I, CT 063	340	1624		
				DATE MAILED: 09/27/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<u></u>		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/808,027	BUNNAGE ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Venkataraman Balasubramanian	1624				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period.	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication.				
Any r	re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stati reply received by the Office later than three months after the mai ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status							
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on $\underline{23}$	<u>March 2004</u> .					
2a) <u></u>	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	4) Claim(s) 22 and 23 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 22 and 23 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicati	on Papers						
10)□	The specification is objected to by the Examir The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to th Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre The oath or declaration is objected to by the B	ccepted or b) objected to by the E e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ection is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/402,229. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment	r(s)						
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 · No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/23/2004</u> .	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1624

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' preliminary amendment, which involved cancellation of claims 1-21 and addition of new claims 22-23, filed on 3/23/ 2004 is made of record.

Claims 22-23 are now pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn et al. US 5,955,611.

Dunn et al. teaches a process for making sildenafil which includes the use of orthohydroxy benzoic acid with piperazinyl sulfonamide group in 4- position with respect to the hydroxyl group as intermediate. See entire document especially formula I, Ii and

Art Unit: 1624

III. Particularly see column 3-4 for a Scheme which teaches the process for making compound V which is same as claimed in the instant genus but excluded by the proviso in claim 22, Also note the process of acylation of the pyrazole VII with the said compound and subsequent cyclization to make sildenafil. See column 6-15 for examples 1-52 and preparations 1-7.

While said compound doesn't anticipate the scope of claim 22 in view of the proviso that when R³ is ethyl, R⁴ is not N-methylpiperain-1-yl-sulfonyl group, they are very closely related, being homologs of compounds i.e. ethoxy group on the phenyl ring in the reference instead of methoxy or propoxy group of instant genus. Similarly, the N-etthylpiperazin-1-yl-sulfonylof instant genus is a homolog of is a homolog of N-methylpiperain-1-yl-sulfonyl group of the reference. However, homologs and compounds that differ only by CH₃ Vs H are not deemed patentably distinct absent evidence of superior or unexpected properties. See In re Wood 199 USPQ 137; In re Lohr 137 USPQ 548.

Again, although said compounds do not anticipate the scope of claim 22, they are very closely related having R¹⁰ as a hydrogen group on the nitrogen of the piperazine group in the instant claims vs methyl on the nitrogen in the reference. However, compounds that differ only in having H vs Me are not deemed patentably distinct absent evidence of superior or unexpected properties. See for compounds that differ only as H vs Me on nitrogen, see Ex parte Weston 121 USPQ 428; In re Doebel 174 USPQ 156.

Art Unit: 1624

Thus, one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to make homologs, and compounds that have H vs methyl on the nitrogen using the same process of making taught for the homolog and expect the process these compounds to possess the utility in the instant case as intermediates to make sildenafil analogs taught by the applied art in view of the close structural similarity outlined above.

Claim 22-23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell et al. US 5,272,147.

Bell et al. teaches several pyrazolopyrimidine compounds useful as antianginal agents, which include instant intermediate compound of claim 22 and the process. See column 1, formula 1, and note the definition of R¹, R², R³, and R⁴. Note the definition of the R³ and R⁴ groups overlap with instant R³ and R⁴. See column 10 for the intermediate X, Especially see lines 4-32 which teaches the same process as that claimed in claim 23.

Bell et al., differs from instant claims in not showing examples of making the compound wherein R⁴ is sulfonylamide bearing a heterocyclic group.

However Bell et al. teaches the equivalency of exemplified compounds with various R^4 substituents with that claimed for formula I, See cols. 1, formula I, especially the definitions of R^3 and R^4 groups as noted above.

Thus, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made would have been motivated to make compounds variously substituted in phenyl ring and the intermediates using the process taught in column 10, lines as permitted by the

Art Unit: 1624

reference and expect resulting compounds (instant compounds) to possess the uses

taught by the art in view of the equivalency teaching outline above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be

addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571)

272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from

8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is

Mukund Shah whose telephone number is (571) 272-0674. If Applicants are unable to

reach Mukund Shah within 24-hour period, they may contact James O. Wilson, Acting-

SPE of art unit 1624 at 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a

general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be

directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Ventularamen Balasuhaman in Venkataraman Balasubramanian

09/22/2004

Page 5